



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/248,736 | 02/11/1999 | TERRY MICHAEL BLEIZEFFER | ST998029 | 9147 |

7590

02/12/2004

Gates & Cooper LLP
Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West Suite 1050
Los Angeles, CA 90045

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

PHAM, KHANH B

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2177

26

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/248,736

Applicant(s)

BLEIZEFFER ET AL.

Examiner

Khanh B. Pham

Art Unit

2177

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claims 1, 3-22, 24-43, 45-77 are rejected by the reasons set forth in the Office Action dated December 2, 2003. Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered but are not persuasive. The examiner respectfully traverses applicant's argument.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C 112, applicant argued that the specification provides support for the limitation "saving the filter and the specified selection criteria". However, applicant's arguments only direct to "saving the specified selection criteria", but not "saving the filter" as claimed. Since "the filter" and "the specified selection criteria" are two different entities, applicant's specification only describes saving "the specified selection criteria" with the objects, but does not describe "saving the filter" as a separate entity. The rejection under 35 U.S.C 112 1st paragraph is hereby sustained.

Regarding the Cotugno reference, (US 6,198,480 B1), applicant argued that Contugno is not valid prior art by relying on the priority date of the provisional application. However, the Contugno reference is used only to reject the limitation "saving the filter and the specified selection criteria", and the provisional application does not provide support for this limitation as required by 35 U.S.C 112 first paragraph, the present application does not qualify for the priority date with respect to this limitation. The Cotugno is therefore a valid prior art. In light of the above argument, the 103 rejection are hereby sustained .